

## **BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

### **July 19, 2012**

Department of Consumer Affairs  
1625 N. Market Blvd., #N-220  
El Dorado Room  
Sacramento, CA 95834

#### *Participating via Teleconference:*

2400 Moorpark Ave., #300  
San Jose, CA 95128

5060 Castille Way  
Riverside, CA 92507

10800 E. Benavon St.  
Whittier, CA 90606

#### **Members Present**

Dr. Christine Wietlisbach, Chair, Public Member  
Dr. Harry Douglas, Public Member  
Dr. Judy Johnson, LEP Member  
Sarita Kohli, LMFT Member  
Patricia Lock-Dawson, Public Member  
Renee Lonner, Chair, LCSW Member  
Christina Wong, LCSW Member

#### **Members Absent**

Karen Pine, Vice Chair, LMFT Member  
Samara Ashley, Public Member

#### **Staff Present**

Kim Madsen, Executive Officer  
Steve Sodergren, Asst. Executive Officer  
Marc Mason, Administrative Manager  
Rosanne Helms, Legislative Analyst  
Christina Kitamura, Administrative Analyst  
Laura Freedman, Legal Counsel

#### **Guest List**

On file

### **FULL BOARD OPEN SESSION**

#### **I. Call to Order and Establishment of a Quorum**

Dr. Christine Wietlisbach, Board Chair, called the meeting to order at approximately 12:09 p.m. Christina Kitamura took roll, and a quorum was established.

Dr. Wietlisbach took items II and III out of order. Item III, SB 1172, was discussed first.

#### **II. Discussion and Possible Action on AB 1904 (Block)**

Rosanne Helms presented AB 1904, Expedited Licensure for Military Spouses.

At its May 2012 meeting, the Board took a “support” position on a previous version of this bill. The previous version would have allowed the Board to issue a temporary license to a military spouse under certain conditions; however, it was left to the discretion of the Board whether or not to do so.

This bill has been amended substantially since the May Board meeting. The bill now requires a board within the Department of Consumer Affairs to expedite the licensing process for an applicant meeting both of the following criteria:

1. Can provide the board with satisfactory evidence that he or she is married, in a domestic partnership, or in a legal union with an active duty member of the U.S. Armed Forces who is assigned to duty in California, and
2. Holds a current license for the same profession in another state.

The bill also allows a board to adopt regulations in order to execute this law.

The author’s office notes that the process of obtaining a state license can cause re-employment delays for military spouses moving between states, and that because of these delays and the expense involved in re-licensure, many of these spouses decide not to practice their profession.

Board staff concerns are:

- The Board does not currently expedite licenses for any of its applicants.
- It is unknown how many Board licensees are spouses of military members stationed in California.
- The Board’s licensing applications would need to be revised so that staff could easily identify which applicants were military spouses, and thus in need of expedition.

Ms. Madsen stated that staff does not receive a great number of applicants that identify themselves as military and/or military spouses. An idea would be to create an application that is assigned a specific color to easily identify those applicants and to track the number of applications received. Ms. Madsen expects to receive about 10 applications a year.

Ms. Madsen added that the parameters of this expedited process can be adopted through regulations.

***Christina Wong moved to support AB 1904. Dr. Judy Johnson seconded.***

Mr. Caldwell stated that AAMFT-CA took a position of support if amended on the original version of AB 1904, supporting the idea of a temporary license. AAMFT-CA has concerns with the amended version of this bill and is now considering changing their position. Mr. Caldwell explained that the issue is not the processing time of the application; the issue is the deficiencies that the applicant will have in coursework and state standards. If this bill passes, their application process may speed up by several weeks, however, the applicant will still have courses to complete and exams to pass. This can take up to a year or longer. This could become an administrative burden on the Board. Mr. Caldwell asked the Board to consider whether this bill is worth supporting or not.

Ms. Lonner stated that there is no indication that staff could receive hundreds of these applications. Fewer than 10 applications per year is not a lot.

Janlee Wong, NASW-CA, agreed with Ms. Lonner. Statistics show that mental health clinicians did not make the top 20 occupations of military spouses in the labor force.

A roll call vote was taken. ***The Board voted unanimously (7-0) to pass the motion.***

### **III. Discussion and Possible Action on SB 1172 (Lieu)**

Ms. Helms presented SB 1172, Sexual Orientation Change Efforts.

At its meeting in May 2012, the Board took an “oppose unless amended” position on the version of this legislation that was amended on April 30, 2012. The Board indicated that an amendment was needed to clarify the definition of sexual orientation change efforts (SOCE).

Since the May Board meeting, the author’s office has amended the bill to clarify the definition of SOCE.

This bill defines “sexual orientation change efforts” as follows:

*Any practices by mental health providers that seek to change an individual’s sexual orientation. This includes efforts to change behaviors or gender expressions, or to eliminate or reduce sexual or romantic attractions or feelings toward individuals of the same sex.*

*“Sexual orientation change efforts” does not include psychotherapies that: (A) provide acceptance, support, and understanding of clients or the facilitation of clients’ coping, social support, and identity exploration and development, including sexual orientation-neutral interventions to prevent or address unlawful conduct or unsafe sexual practices; and (B) do not seek to change sexual orientation.*

This bill also prohibits a mental health provider from engaging in sexual orientation change efforts with a patient under 18 years of age, and considers any sexual orientation change efforts performed by a mental health provider on a patient under 18 to be unprofessional conduct, and would subject the provider to disciplinary action by their licensing entity.

Ms. Helms noted that although this bill would make it unprofessional conduct for a therapist to perform sexual orientation change efforts on a client under 18, the bill does not place this provision in the unprofessional conduct code sections for each of the Board’s four license types.

Ms. Helms also noted that the support and opposition listed in the analysis is from the May 2012 analysis. A current listing of support and opposition was not available for the July analysis.

Rebecca Gonzales, National Association of Social Workers California Chapter (NASW-CA), stated that the California Psychological Association is considering changing their position to support.

Ms. Lonner acknowledged that the bill was amended exactly as the Board had requested.

***Renee Lonner moved to support SB 1172. Dr. Harry Douglas seconded.***

Ben Caldwell, American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy California Division (AAMFT-CA), stated that AAMFT-CA supports SB 1172.

Ms. Gonzales stated that NASW-CA supports SB 1172.

Dr. Judy Johnson stated that she supports SB 1172, and that this is a good step for California.

Luisa Mardones, California Society for Clinical Social Work (CSCSW), stated that CSCSW is also in support of this bill.

A roll call vote was taken. ***The Board voted unanimously (7-0) to pass the motion.***

**IV. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda**

No public comments were made.

**V. Suggestions for Future Agenda Items**

No suggestions for future agenda items were made.

**FULL BOARD CLOSED SESSION**

**VI. Pursuant to Government Code Section 11126(c)(3), the Board Will Meet in Closed Session to Deliberate and Take Action on Disciplinary Matters**

**FULL BOARD OPEN SESSION**

**VII. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned after the Board met in closed session.